

If indeed it would not be made up by increased importations of woollens at a lower rate. And, to answer in advance any argument that might be based upon the suggestion of increased importations, it may be added that with the price of woollen goods reduced the consumption of woollens would be so much increased that we would have a larger production at home as well as an increase of importations.

If the democratic party desires to win the confidence of the country it must have the courage to advance a principle and to stand by it. If protection is right, let the democratic party admit that it has been in error for a generation and that it now recognizes that the republican party has been right in demanding protection. If, however, the principle of protection is wrong, let the democrats have the courage to oppose it and begin their fight against it by removing the tariff on wool which is the keystone of the protective arch. Every protectionist knows that free wool would prove the death knell of the protective system and therefore every protectionist is a defender of the tariff on wool—the avowed protectionists admitting that they want protection—those protectionists who are not willing to openly indorse the system hiding under the pretense that they want a tariff on wool for revenue purposes.

If the democratic party expects to make a bold fight for the relief of the people from high taxation it must not allow itself to be frightened by the clamor of any protected interest, even the wool growers. And as a matter of policy it should remember that those sheep growers who allow their sheep to do their voting will oppose a reduction of one-half the tariff on wool as bitterly as they would oppose a removal of the entire duty. There is nothing to be gained by cutting the wool tariff half in two, while such a concession to the wool growers very properly angers those who use woollen goods and who recognize that a tariff on wool increases the cost of woollen goods.

The democratic party has a great opportunity to take a step forward in the direction of tariff reduction. Will it do it?

POPULAR ELECTION OF SENATORS

When the present congress convenes in its first regular session in December the democratic majority will do well to recognize, to the full, the responsibility it bears in shaping of the lines of the next campaign. Three questions that occupied a prominent position during the first session have been disposed of. Publicity (before the election) as to campaign contributions has been secured. This is a really great reform and carries out a plank of the democratic national platform of 1908. Arizona and New Mexico have been admitted to statehood—this is a deserved recognition of the claims of these two young commonwealths. Reciprocity has been offered to Canada and has been rejected by her—this ends the consideration of reciprocity for the present.

The program announced at the beginning of the special session began with the election of senators by the people. Resolutions submitting the amendment have passed both the house and the senate and are now in conference. While the final submission of a resolution would seem certain it must be remembered that a partisan issue has been raised in connection with this amendment and that that partisan issue not only jeopardizes the submission of the amendment, but what is still more alarming, jeopardizes the ratification of it when submitted. It requires a two-thirds vote in both houses to submit an amendment to the constitution and it requires ratification by three-fourths of the states to adopt the amendment. As neither party controls three-fourths of the states it is impossible to secure an indorsement by three-fourths of the states of the purely partisan proposition. The partisan issue raised in connection with the election of the senators by the people is an old one—viz., as to whether the federal government or the state government should have the final word in the control of elections. Democrats lean to the idea of state control while republicans emphasize the importance of federal supervision. The resolution as it passed the house embodies the democratic idea and vests in the state the power of control over senatorial elections. The resolution as it passed the senate leaves the question of control of senatorial elections in the same position as the control of congressional elections, and both republicans and democrats construe this to mean that the right of federal supervision is reserved.

Thus far the conference committee has not been able to agree upon a resolution acceptable

to both the senate and the house for the reason that there is no compromise ground between these two theories. It would seem the part of wisdom, therefore, to seek a wording of the resolution which, instead of compromising the two theories, would eliminate the question entirely by leaving the partisan situation exactly as it is now. How can this be done?

There is one way in which the partisan issue may be entirely removed and that plan is now under consideration. Let the resolution be so worded as to provide for the popular election of senators but let a provision be added which will permit any state to return for a limited period to the present method of electing senators by the legislature, whenever the electors of the state demand it by popular vote. The advantage of this plan is two fold. In the first place IT BRINGS ALL STATES TO THE POPULAR METHOD OF ELECTING SENATORS. This is the end aimed at. At the same time IT PERMITS ANY STATE TO RETURN TO THE PRESENT METHOD IF ITS PEOPLE SO DESIRE. The return should be for a limited period—six, eight, ten or twelve years, but these periods could be successively renewed.

When the optional plan was first suggested objection was made to it on the ground that some of the states might not adopt the popular methods of election, but this objection is obviated if the amendment compels all states to adopt the direct method. A return for a limited period to the present method, upon the demand of the people, would enable the southern states to secure protection from a force bill, if a force bill was ever passed. The danger of a force bill is a very remote one and yet even an imaginary danger may frighten some, and an amendment which permitted federal supervision as to the election of senators and gave to the southern states no means of escape from it might arouse a fear sufficient to prevent the ratification of the amendment by the southern states.

The plan above proposed does not change the present law—it does not deprive the federal government of any power which it now has and the return to the present method does not give the southern states any protection which they do not now have. In other words, the proposed plan simply removes the partisan question and gives us the election of senators by the people as a distinct and separate issue which can be decided upon its own merits. If there is any better plan The Commoner will be glad to indorse it. But until a better plan is proposed it urges upon the consideration of senators and members this plan for the securing of the popular election of United States senators. It urges this reform as the "gate way to other reforms"—this is the language of the Denver platform and it is well chosen language.

No republican can object to this plan unless he is anxious to secure a partisan victory in connection with the election of senators by the direct vote and he ought not to expect a partisan victory in connection with a constitutional amendment until the republicans have three-fourths of the states.

No democrat can complain of the plan unless he is more anxious to secure a partisan victory than he is to secure the election of senators by the people, and no democrat ought to expect a partisan victory in connection with the constitutional amendment until the democrats have three-fourths of the states.

This is a situation which the democrats must meet. If they will lay aside all thought of securing a partisan victory and urge this plan, or some other plan which will eliminate the partisan issue, and give the people the election of senators by direct vote they will be in a position to invite the judgment of the country upon their conduct. If the republicans imitate them in a willingness to eliminate partisanship the reform will be secured. If, however, the republicans show themselves more wedded to partisanship than to this great reform they will be put upon the defensive in the next campaign. The Commoner appeals to democrats and to progressive republicans to lay aside the partisan prejudice that has thus far prevented a conference report and unite in a demand for the election of senators by direct vote of the people. It can be secured through an amendment that presents this issue and this issue alone.

THE PHILIPPINE QUESTION

Our democratic congress can not afford to adjourn without acting upon the Philippine question and when it does act it has no choice but to carry out the pledge of the democratic platform. In three national campaigns the

democratic party has stood for a resolution promising independence for the Filipinos. This promise should be fulfilled at once. Our government should reserve such coaling stations and naval bases as may be necessary but the people should be assured that our country does not contemplate the continuance of a colonial policy.

If there was ever any doubt of the wisdom of promising independence all doubt has been removed by the fight which the Chinese are making for the establishment of a republic. With the Orientals demanding a republic, how can this, the greatest of republics, defend the colonial system almost within sight of China? Congress ought to act and act at once. If the senate refuses to join in the passage of the resolution, let the senate take the responsibility. The democrats, at least, ought to go on record in favor of applying American ideas and ideals in the Philippines.

The platform of 1908 suggests neutralization of the islands and this idea should be embodied in the resolution promising independence. There is no reason to doubt that all of the leading nations would, in exchange for equal commercial privileges, agree to recognize the right of the Filipinos to work out their own destiny under the republic form of government.

Let the democratic congress sound a bugle note in favor of the doctrine that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and this note will be heard around the world.

MORE LIGHT

Congress having passed, and the president having signed, the measure providing for publicity, BEFORE THE ELECTION, as to campaign contributions, the country is ready for another step forward.

Our democratic congress should pass immediately a measure requiring publicity, first, as to campaign funds used to secure the nomination of presidential candidates; second, as to the recommendations filed with the president in behalf of applicants for appointments which have to be confirmed by the senate; and, third, as to the ownership of papers which use the mails. We need more light on all these subjects—it will be difficult for opponents to find a reasonable argument against such a measure.

Why not publicity as to influences which secure nominations as well as to influences which control elections? Every organization formed to advance the interests of a candidate and every individual who uses money in behalf of a candidate should be compelled to file a statement showing money subscribed or employed and the publication should be AT THE TIME THE SUBSCRIPTION IS MADE OR THE MONEY USED.

Every written recommendation of applicants for presidential appointments should be kept on file and be open for inspection, and no verbal recommendations should be permitted. Papers, periodicals and magazines using the mails should be compelled to file a list of stockholders or owners and to file also a statement of indebtedness where it exceeds one-third of cost or present value of plant. The progressive republicans of the senate would in all probability support such a measure and the president would hardly risk the criticism which a veto would arouse.

THE LABOR QUESTION

The democratic congress should carry out the democratic platform on the labor question:

"The courts of justice are the bulwark of our liberties, and we yield to none in our purpose to maintain their dignity. Our party has given to the bench a long line of distinguished judges who have added to the respect and confidence in which this department must be jealously maintained. We resent the attempt of the republican party to raise a false issue respecting the judiciary. It is an unjust reflection upon a great body of our citizens to assume that they lack respect for the courts.

"It is the function of the courts to interpret the laws which the people create, and if the laws appear to work economic, social or political injustice, it is our duty to change them. The only basis upon which the integrity of our courts can stand is that of unswerving justice and protection of life, personal liberty and property. If judicial processes may be abused, we should guard against abuse.

"Experience has proven the necessity of a modification of the present law relating to injunctions, and we reiterate the pledge of our national platforms of 1896 and 1904 in favor of the measure which passed the United States senate in 1896, but which a republican congress has